Chapter 5
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

5.1 SUMMARY

This chapter of the Specific Plan identifies and assesses the potential environmental impacts associated with the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan. It follows requisite state and local guidelines. The Project Description is the Specific Plan itself, which also includes text and maps on the environmental Setting Factors. Principal features include the following: no major seismic concerns, area of steep topography in Sycamore Canyon, bedrock outcroppings, adverse regional air quality, 100-year flood zone and riparian habitat in Sycamore Canyon, two small quarry pits, significant noise and accident potential from March AFB, several major utility corridors, and potential major developments in surrounding areas.

The major environmental effect of development under Specific Plan land use policies are summarized as follows: retention of the Sycamore Canyon area as open space, significant increase in utility demands and traffic generation, increased air emissions, and a large increase in employment within the Specific Plan Area.

5.2 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The report which follows was prepared for the City of Riverside in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, (CEQA) Guidelines, as amended through January 1, 1982. It evaluates the environmental effects of the Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines (Sec. 15149), the entire Specific Plan is incorporated by reference as part of this document. Consideration of environmental factors was an integral part of the Specific Plan's development. As such, many of the points required to be in an EIR (CEQA Guidelines, Article 9) are addressed in the Plan itself.

Chapter 5 provides an index describing where information mandated by environmental law is contained, discusses potential significant impacts, and quantifies those factors which lend themselves to that type of analysis.

The Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan, in particular, Chapter 2 (Development Plan), is the proposed project. Figures 1 through 8 illustrate various aspects of the Plan, including its regional and local setting, proposed land uses as well as circulation, landscaping/urban

design, utilities, and phasing plans. Table 1 shows the land use allocations for the Specific Plan area and presents an estimate of building square footage.

TABLE 1
Land Use Distribution Summary

USE	GROSS ACRES
Retail Business and Offices	137
Industrial	802
Industrial Support	33
Arroyo (Sycamore Canyon)	431
Total	1,403

5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The setting for the Specific Plan is described in Chapter 1 (Introduction and Background). It contains a description of the Sycamore Canyon Plan's relationship to past city and county plans relative to the area; the Southeast Study Area Report (April 1980) and the Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) report for March Air Force Base (October 1979).

The Southeast Area Study Report contains a series of descriptive maps with related text describing the various factors which will affect development of the project area. These maps include the currently Adopted Plan which stipulates land use policy. "Industrial Park" is designated for the bulk of this area. Sycamore Canyon, as defined by slope gradients in excess of 15%, is stipulated for "natural arroyo". The existing sewage treatment plant is recognized as "public and institutional".

The result of these planning efforts has been the focus of attention towards a definite policy for development.

Of more immediate concern to the project study area is the proposed regional development at the southeast juncture of the Escondido Freeway (I-215) and the Pomona Freeway (Route 60). Known as "The Springs", this project is presently planned to include 200 acres of light industrial uses plus 80 to 90 acres of shopping center and retail/office

uses. The development of this large regional center will strongly influence the potential market absorption of the entire Box Springs area.

In addition, the Environmental Impact Report for Box Springs Landfill, October, 1981, County of Riverside by Willdan Associates and CDM Engineers, provides a detailed environmental setting and impact description of a proposed 295 acre sanitary landfill. The report addresses one of several alternative landfill sites; in this case, centrally located within the Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan Area. This proposal has been strongly opposed by the City of Riverside and would not be in conformance with the Specific Plan. It does, however, contain background material useful for the present report.

Table 2 describes various environmental setting factors relative to the Study Area. References to sources documents are as follows:

SEAS "Southeast Area Study, Policy Report", Riverside City Planning Department, November 1980

LND "Box Springs Sanitary Landfill, draft EIR" County of Riverside by Willdan Associates and CDM Engineers, October 1981

SPGS "The Springs, draft EIR" County of Riverside by Ultrasystems, Inc., January 1982

SFR "Southeast Area Plan, Sewer Feasibility Report", City of Riverside by Albert A. Webb, Associates, August 1981

SI "Preliminary Soils Investigation, Portion of Box Springs" for Sid Lance Construction by CHJ Materials Laboratory, Inc., October 1979

AICUZ "Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Report, March AFB", Department of the Air Force, October 1979

B/A Beland/Associates, Inc. primary research preparatory to the Box Springs Specific Plan, November 1981 through March 1982

All of the pertinent environmental setting data is summarized in Table 2 or included, as referenced to the Specific Plan itself, with the exception of vehicle circulation and transportation. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a survey of these factors.

TABLE 2
Environmental Setting Factors

*References in text following table.

Factors	Description	Source *
EARTH		
Seismic Hazard	No fault zone traverses area; Major earthquake possible region, area in low shaking zone with low slope instability; Seismic not major concern.	SEAS
Soils	Class C, areas of steep terrain, light erosion hazard and severe septic tank limitation in Sycamore Canyon; Class A and B level terrain, slight erosion and low runoff remainder of study area. Most upper native soils will not provide uniform or adequate support for industrial structure.	SEAS, SI
Topography	30% to 70% slopes in Sycamore Canyon (±250 acres); small ravines with slopes of 15% to 30% branching out of Sycamore Canyon; remainder of area is gently rolling hills with slopes generally less than 15%. Elevation from 1,100 feet to 1,600 feet.	SEAS, B/A
Unique Features	Sycamore Canyon	SEAS
Wind Erosion/Hazard	Minor	B/A
Water Erosion	Minor, except in Sycamore Canyon	SEAS
Geologic Hazards	Granite bedrock outcropping at scattered locations throughout study area	SEAS, SI, SFR
AIR		
Air Emissions/quality	Region subject to high pollutant levels with adverse inversion layers averaging 191 days each year. Mobile sources within Los Angeles and Orange County major pollutants generators; local sources from adjacent freeways	LND

Odors	None reported; of possible concern in areas adjacent to Sewage Treatment Plant	SEAS, LND, SPGS
Climate	Mild with cool, wet winters and warm dry summers	LND

TABLE 2 - Environmental Setting Factors (cont'd)

Factors	Description	Source *
WATER		
Surface Flow and Drainage	Sycamore Canyon is principal drainage course, some year round springs within the canyon	SEAS
Absorption Rate	High in flat and gently sloping areas (less than 15%); low in Sycamore Canyon	SEAS
Flood Water	100-year flood zone within confines of Sycamore Canyon	B/A
Surface Water	Two smaller filled quarry pits in southcentral portion Study Area	LND
Ground Water and Quality	Some springs in Sycamore Canyon, depth from 12-25 feet in potential development areas; groundwater slightly artesian, irrigation does not impact groundwater, difficult to delineate aquifer boundaries	LND
ANIMAL &		
Diversity of	See Discussion Appendix A	
Unique/Rare	See Discussion Appendix A	
NOISE		
Noise Level	Significant impact from March AFB, nearly entire area within 75 dB (A) contour, most within 80 dB (A) contour, also noise generation from I-15E and Alessandro as well as railroad	AICUZ
Exposure to Noise	Minor, limited to 19 residences adjacent to I-15E	B/A
LIGHT & GLARE	Little impact within Study Area	B/A

LAND USE	19 Single-family residence adjacent to I-15E with access from unimproved dirt road (16 in MP zone, 3 in C-2 zone), total of 41 persons in these residences; several small shops and a tavern near corner of I-15E and Alessandro; ±450 acres under cultivation including 50 irrigated acres owned by ECSD; 8 acres ECSD sewage treatment plant; remainder of 1,417 acre site open space. Adjacent properties: vacant land to north; vacant open space and MWD Water Filtration Plant to west; March AFS to south; small industrial park and Edgemont Community to east	SEAS B/A

TABLE 2 - Environmental Setting Factors (cont'd)

Factors	Description	Source *
RESOURCES	Abandoned granite quarry in southeast portion of Study Area adjacent to Alessandro Blvd.; proposed rock quarry operation currently under consideration in northwestern portion of Study Area. This operation would result in leveling several granite outcroppings resulting in level topography.	B/A
HAZARDS		
Toxic Substances	None known within Study Area	B/A
Hazardous Conditions	320 acre portion of southeast portion Study Area in March AFB Accidental Potential Zone 2, the least critical of three accident hazard zones; Only industrial and limited commercial uses are recommended within this zone. The Study Area is traversed by a 30 inch natural gas line, and there is 6 inch aviation fuel line adjacent to the west of the AT & SF r-o-w	AICUZ
Emergency Plans	Study Area covered by City and County Disaster Preparedness	B/A
POPULATION GROWTH	None within Study Area, minor in adjacent areas.	B/A

HOUSING	See Land Use, currently 19 single-family units with Study Area.	SEAS, AICUZ
TRANSPORTATION & CIRCULATION	See description included on this Section of the EIR and Section 2.2 of the Specific Plan.	B/A
PUBLIC SERVICES		
Police	California Highway Patrol and City of Riverside	LND
Fire	Riverside County Fire Dept., State Dept. of Forestry, City of Riverside; response times ±4 minutes; Fire Rating of 2.	LND
Schools	None	
Parks	Sycamore Canyon considered for public open space for over 50 years by currently not utilized as such.	SEAS
Public Facilities	8 acre ECSD sewage treatment plant	SEAS, SFR

TABLE 2 - Environmental Setting Factors (cont'd)

Factors	Description	Source *
ENERGY	Very minor demand on energy resources at present	B/A
UTILITIES	See Section 2.4 of Specific Plan	B/A, SFR, SEAS
HUMAN HEALTH	See Hazards	B/A, SEAS
PUBLIC SERVICES		
Police	California Highway Patrol and City of Riverside	LND

Fire	Riverside County Fire Dept., State Dept. of Forestry, City of Riverside; response times ±4 minutes; Fire Rating of 2	LND
Schools	None	
Parks	Sycamore Canyon considered for public open space for over 50 years by currently not utilized as such.	SEAS
Public Facilities	8 acre ECSD sewage treatment plant	SEAS, SFR
ENERGY	Very minor demand on energy resources at present	B/A
UTILITIES	See Section 2.4 of Specific Plan	B/A, SFR, SEAS
HUMAN HEALTH	See Hazards	B/A, SEAS
CULTURAL		
Paleontology	No sites known	SEAS
Archaeology	See discussion Appendix B	
Historic	No significant sites known	SEAS

The local street system which provides access to the study area, as well as planned street improvements, are described in the City's "Southeast Area Study, Policy Report", April 11, 1980. Access to the study area includes the following streets:

Alessandro Boulevard

This major arterial is the southern border of the study area. It is currently developed with four traffic lanes, although full right-of-way and improvements have not been completed. It will be an eight lane divided major between Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and interstate 215, the remainder as a six lane divided major.

Sycamore Canyon Boulevard

This north/south street is planned as an 110 foot arterial with four traffic lanes, with a 134 foot arterial section for one block north of Alessandro. It would run from a connection on Box Springs Boulevard in the northeasterly corner of the Specific Plan area southerly to Eastridge Avenue. The streets extension south of Eastridge Avenue is offset several hundred yards east of the northerly half of the street. This portion of the Sycamore Canyon Boulevard extends southerly to Alessandro Boulevard. Sycamore Canyon Boulevard is currently unimproved, with only a small section of r-o-w acquired by the City. The construction would most likely require bridging a portion of Sycamore Canyon.

Box Springs Boulevard (extension)

This street is fully improved to a point approximately 400 feet south of Eastridge Avenue. The plan calls for extension of Box Springs Boulevard southerly to a point several hundred yards north of Alessandro at which it will curve to the west, connecting with Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The street improvements will be a 66' collector.

Eastridge Avenue

This street is planned as an 88 foot-wide major arterial connecting the future Sycamore Canyon Boulevard with Highway I-215.The eastern portion of Eastridge Avenue has already been constructed to four lanes, while the western portion (i.e., west of Highway I-215) has only two lanes.

Fisher Road

Fisher Road is not within the study area; however, it provides an important link in the local circulation system. This street is proposed as a 66 foot wide secondary street with two travel

lanes from Box Springs Boulevard to Highway I-215. It is presently improved to two lanes, but lacks curbs, gutters and turning movement controls. No funds have been earmarked in the City's present six-year Capital Improvement Program to widen existing arterials or extend planned arterials in the study area. Current city policy includes city participation in widening and construction of arterials adjacent to industrial development, however the extent to which funds will be available for such projects in the future is in question.

Highway I-215 (Escondido Freeway)

Previously designated US 395, this highway is located adjacent to the eastern border of the project area. Highway I-15E is a defacto four lane divided highway with a central median and is not currently developed to freeway standards. There is a signalized four-way intersection at Alessandro Boulevard. Access to the project area from I-215 is difficult because of the lack of traffic control and the AT&SF Railroad r-o-w running adjacent to its west side. Alessandro is the only controlled access across the railroad. The crossings at Bay Avenue, Cottonwood Avenue, Dracaea Avenue and Eastridge Avenue are limited to median breaks with stop signs. It is especially dangerous to cross I-215 at these points because of the large amount of fast-moving traffic.

Access to residences south of Eastridge Avenue and west of the Highway I-215 from an unimproved frontage road, portions of which may be within the railroad r-o-w. It is not clear whether there is a dedicated easement for this frontage road and there is currently no city, county, or state plans which may address the road's future status.

This Specific Plan calls for an improvement program for I-215 which would include widening, median improvements, and interchanges at Alessandro Boulevard and Eastridge Avenue.

A single-branch railway line operated by the Santa Fe Railroad, is contiguous with a major portion of the project area's eastern border. There are no active spurs or sidings from this line into the project area.

5.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Consideration of potential environmental impacts has been a key factor in planning efforts dealing with the Box Springs area. This is most evident in that the Sycamore Canyon area has been designated as open space for over 50 years as well as in the evaluation presented in the "Southeast Area Study, Policy Report", November 1980.

5.4.1 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT/MITIGATION MEASURES

Quantifiable potential impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Specific Plan are presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5. Table 3 assesses utility impacts; Table 4, traffic generation; and Table 5, air quality. These tables present a worst case scenario, and as such assume the maximum potential for development under Specific Plan Standards and Criteria (see Chapter 3).

An impact evaluation matrix is presented as Table 6. This table shows the major environmental effects likely to be associated with full development under Specific Plan land use guidelines. A number of mitigation measures to help reduce potentially negative impacts have been included as policies in the Specific Plan; while those indicated as 'other' are measures which would be constructive, but which have not yet been formally adoptive or would be applicable on a more detailed level.

5.5 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The discussion and adoption of Specific Plan detailed land use alternatives was a continuous process which evolved during a series of Citizen Advisory Committee meetings over a period of six months. Basic land use concepts for the planning area as identified from environmental factors were defined in the "Southeast Area Study", November 1980.

Alternative land use scenarios are described as follows:

Status Quo

This would result in preserving the essentially undeveloped character of the Study Area. The environmentally sensitive Sycamore Canyon Area is designed to remain as open space in the present Specific Plan.

Retention of remaining open space, which is primarily agricultural was rejected because this use is no longer viable. Environmental impacts associated with development, e.g. traffic, increased demand on utilities, and increased air pollutant emission would not occur if the Study Area remained in its present condition.

Residential Development

Residential development within the Study Area was not considered suitable because of adverse noise and the accident potential from March AFB.

Commercial Development

Extensive commercial development was not originally proposed because of proposals for construction of an extensive commercial/business center and regional shopping center directly to the east of the Planning Area (i.e., "The Springs" development). Aircraft noise and accident potential also restrict the type of commercial uses allowable within the Study Area.

SPA-3-878

Proposed development of a commercial auto mall. An addendum to this EIR was prepared for that amendment. Copies of the addendum can be obtained by the Planning Department.

5.6 ENVIRONMENTAL/PRODUCTIVITY RELATIONSHIP

The cumulative, long term effect of enactment of the Specific Plan will be the construction, and possible culmination of urbanization in the northeastern portion of the City of Riverside. The Specific Plan provides an opportunity for future industrial and some commercial development, while providing critical environmental safeguards.

5.7 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS (IF ANY)

No major irreversible changes are anticipated as a result of implementing the Specific Plan. Environmentally sensitive areas will be retained in a natural condition, while past agricultural use is no longer considered viable.

TABLE 3
Utility Demand Projections

Land Use	Water [1] (1,000 gallons/day)				Sewage [2] (1,000 gallons/day)				Power [3] (1,000 kWh/day)				Natural Gas [4] (1,000 c.f./day)				Solid Waste [5] (1,000 lbs/day)			
	I	II	III	Total	I	II	III	Total	I	II	III	Total	I	II	III	Total	I	II	III	Total
Manufacturing	266	122	286	674	246	112	266	624	440	200	480	1120	353	161	383	897	198	91	213	502
Warehouse, Distribution	443	203	477	1123	412	188	442	1042	210	100	230	540	592	271	636	1499	330	151	355	836
Research, Office, Restaurant	177	81	191	449	164	76	176	416	200	90	220	510	250	116	268	634	64	60	69	193
Business, Finance, Professional	-	24	-	24	-	22	-	22	-	27	-	27	-	34	-	34	-	9	-	9
Auto Service, Rental	-	11	-	11	-	10	-	10	-	12	-	12	-	15	-	15	-	4	-	4
Total	886	441	954	2281	822	408	884	2114	850	429	930	2209	1195	597	1287	3079	592	315	637	1544

Beland/Associates, Inc.

1. Source: “City of Los Angeles EIR Manual”, August 1975 (updated) assumes 50 gal. per day per employee, industrial 30 gal. per day per employee commercial, plus .132 gal/day sq. ft. of landscaped area.
2. Source: “Southeast Area Plan Sewer Feasibility”, August 1981 assumes 2,000 gal/acre/day.
3. Source: “City of Los Angeles EIR Manual”, August 1975 (updated) assumes 34.2 annual kWh/sq. ft. office, 14.4 annual kWh/sq. ft. warehouse, 50.1 annual kWh/sq. ft. industrial.
4. Source: “City of Los Angeles EIR Manual”, August 1975 (updated) assumes 3.5 cubic feet/month/sq. ft. office, and 3.3 cubic feet/month/sq. ft. industrial.
5. Source: “City of Los Angeles EIR Manual”, August 1975 (updated) assumes 21 lbs/employee/day commercial, and 41lbs/employee/day/industrial.

TABLE 4
Vehicle Generation

Land Use	Trip End Generation Rate	Daily Trips Generation			
		Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Total
Manufacturing	79 per net acre	9,720	4,420	10,510	24,650
Warehouse Distribution	81 per net acre	16,690	7,610	17,900	42,200
Research/Office/Restaurant	45 per net acre	3,690	1,710	3,960	9,360
Business/Finance/Professional	60 per net acre	-	660	-	660
Automotive Service Station/ Rental	100 per net acre	-	500	-	500
Open Space Areas/Natural Arroyo	0.5 per total acre	-	-	-	130
Total		30,100	14,900	32,370	77,500

Beland/Associates, Inc.

TABLE 5
Motor Vehicle Generated Air Emissions (LBS/DAY)

Pollutant	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Total	Total 1987 Riverside County Emissions	Percent Project of Riverside CO.
Carbon Monoxide	11,220	5,560	12,070	28,850	500,000	5.8
Total Hydrocarbons	1,070	530	1,150	2,750	40,000	6.9
Nitrogen Oxides	1,220	600	1,300	3,120	120,000	2.6
Sulfur Oxides	120	20	130	300	30,000	1.0
Particulates	190	90	200	480	100,000	0.5

Beland/Associates, Inc.

1. Source: "11th Progress Report on Trip End Generation Research Counts" July 1976 assumes 64 TE per gross acre Industrial Park, 81 TE per net acre warehouse, 60 TE per net acre administration, 31 TE per net acre research and development, 15 TE per 1,000 sq. ft. floor area commercial.

2. This table was developed based on the method outlined in the "City of Los Angeles EIR Manual" August 1975 (updated) the SCAQMD "Air Quality Handbook for Environmental Impact Reports" October 1980, and the SCAQMD/SCAG "Air Quality Management Plan", January 1979; assumes average vehicle speed of 25 mph, 697,500 vehicle miler per day (9 miles per trip).

TABLE 6
Environmental Impact Evaluation Matrix

Description of Impact	Mitigation Measure	
	Specific Plan	**Other**
TOPOGRAPHIC & GEOLOGIC FACTORS		
Seismic hazards are a major concern throughout Southern California; however there are no specific characteristics of the Study Area which require special consideration.	Preservation of Sycamore Canyon as open space (see Section 2.0)	Incorporation of seismic design features as described
Soils not adequate to support industrial structures		Compacted filled probably required, conformance with recommendations of project specific soils reports
Minor Impact on Sycamore Canyon reparian area		
AIR		
Air emissions generated by project related traffic increases the potential for significantly impacting local air quality. While the actual impact is consistent with SCAG-82 Growth Forecast Policy and the Air Quality Master Plan, development under the Specific Plan would contribute over 7% of the total emissions for certain pollutants in the Riverside Area.		Implementation of various public transportation concepts
WATER		
100 year flood zone and principal drainage course through Sycamore Canyon	Retention of Sycamore Canyon as open space (see Section 2.0)	
PLANTS & ANIMALS		
See Discussion Appendix A	See Discussion Appendix A	
HAZARDS		
320 acre portion of Study Area in March AFB Accident Potential Zone 2 (APZ 2)	Restriction of uses in APZ2 to those allowable under the recommendation of the March AFB AICUZ, such as light manufacturing and ware-housing.	Incorporation of measures to prevent impacts from industrial spills where applicable
Industrial waste spills		
TRANSPORTATION / CIRCULATION		
Significant increase in average daily traffic, with the most intensive traffic likely at the Eastridge Ave/ I-215 and Alessandro Road/ I-215 as many as 31,000 vehicle per day would pass through this intersection at ultimate build-out. The Alessandro Road/ I-15E intersection is expected to be impacted by up to 35% of project traffic for an increase of approximately 27,000 vehicles per weekday.	Development of a full interchange at Eastridge Ave/ I-215 and Alessandro Blvd/ I-215	Development of a full interchange at Eastridge Ave/I-215 and Alessandro Blvd/ I-215 with close coordination with the AT&SF Railroad

TABLE 6 - Environmental Impact Evaluation Matrix (cont'd)

Description of Impact	Mitigation Measure	
	Specific Plan	Other
NOISE		
Significant Impact from March AFB	Limiting permitted uses to those allowable under March AFB AICUZ Guidelines (See Section 3.1)	
LAND USE		
Loss of ±450 acres of land under cultivation, although agriculture is not considered a viable use for property because of declining economic return, and marginal soil quality.		
PUBLIC SERVICES		
Development under Specific Plan land use designation would create additional burdens of fire and police protection resulting in a need for additional equipment and personnel.		Revenue generated by projected development is expected to offset additional service costs.
ENERGY		
Projected development would result in the additional consumption of electricity and natural gas, although increases are within the projections of local utilities and are not expected to adversely effect non-renewable energy supply on regional basis.		Incorporation of energy saving devices into building construction through a coordinated effort between developers and local utilities.
UTILITIES (excepting energy)		
Substantial increases in water, sewerage, and solid waste are projected.		Projected increases are within the ranges estimated and planned for by local utilities.
HUMAN HEALTH		
No Significant impact on local or regional health care facilities is expected to occur as a result of proposed project.		
CULTURAL		
See Appendix B	See Discussion Appendix B	

TABLE 7
Environmental Factors Matrix

Environmental Factors which will affect, or be affected by, current land uses or potential land use changes:

X	Major Effect
0	Moderate or Potential Effect
-	Limited or Negligible Effect

Environmental Factors	Land Use Plan Areas					
	Phase I	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Open Space**	**City Wide**	**Region Wide**
EARTH						
Seismic Hazards	0	0	0	-	X	X
Soil Conditions	0	0	0	-	-	-
Topography	-	-	0	-	-	-
Unique Features	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wind Erosion/Hazard	-	-	-	-	-	-
Water Erosion	-	-	-	0	0	0
Geologic Hazards	-	-	-	-	-	-
AIR						
Air Emissions/Quality	X	X	X	-	X	X
Odors	0	-	-	-	-	-
Climate	-	-	-	-	-	-
WATER						
Surface Flow	-	-	-	-	-	-
Absorption Rates	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drainage Patterns	-	-	-	-	-	-
Flood Water	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surface Water (Lakes)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Flow of Ground Water	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ground Water Quality	-	-	-	-	-	-
Water Quality	-	-	-	-	-	-
PLANTS & ANIMALS						
Diversity of Species	0	0	0	-	0	0
Unique/Rare Species	0	0	0	-	0	0

TABLE 7 - Environmental Factors Matrix (cont'd)

Environmental Factors	Land Use Plan Areas					
	Phase I	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Open Space**	**City Wide**	**Region Wide**
NOISE						
Noise Level	0	0	0	-	-	-
Exposure to Noise	0	0	0	-	-	-
LIGHT AND GLARE	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAND USE	0	0	0	-	-	-
RESOURCES						
Use Natural Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deplete Resources	-	-	-	-	-	-
HAZARDS						
Toxic Substances/ Hazardous Waste	-	-	-	-	-	-
Emergency Plans	0	0	0	-	0	0
Accident Potential	0	0	0	-	-	-
POPULATION GROWTH	0	0	X	-	X	0
HOUSING						
Existing Housing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Housing Factors	-	-	-	-	-	-
TRANSPORTATION/ CIRCULATION						
Vehicle Movement	0	0	0	-	0	-
Parking	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transportation Systems	0	0	0	-	0	0
Circulation Patterns	0	0	0	-	0	0
Rail Traffic	0	-	-	-	0	-
Air Traffic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Traffic Hazards	-	-	-	-	-	-
PUBLIC SERVICES						
Fire Protection	0	0	0	-	0	-
Police Protection	0	0	0	-	0	-
Schools	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parks/Related Facilities	-	-	-	-	-	-
Public Facilities/Services	0	0	0	-	-	-
Other Government Services	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE 7 - Environmental Factors Matrix (cont'd)

Environmental Factors	Land Use Plan Areas					
	Phase I	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Open Space**	**City Wide**	**Region Wide**
ENERGY						
Fuel or Energy	0	0	0	-	-	-
Demand on Energy	0	0	0	-	0	-
UTILITIES						
Power	0	0	0	-	0	-
Natural Gas	0	0	0	-	0	-
Communication	0	0	0	-	0	-
Water	0	0	0	-	0	-
Sewer	0	0	0	-	0	-
Storm Drain	0	0	0	-	0	-
Solid Waste	0	0	0	-	0	-
HUMAN HEALTH	-	-	-	-	-	-
AESTHETICS	0	0	0	0	-	-
CULTURAL						
Archaeology	-	-	-	0	-	-
Paleontology	-	-	-	-	-	-
Historic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unique Cultural Values	-	-	-	-	-	-

5.8 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Specific Plan does not so much induce growth as it accommodates and provides a mechanism to control it. The increased employment base provided by projected industrial development will increase the demand for local housing. An estimate of the employment and population based on employment at total build-out of the Specific Plan Phases is presented on Table 7.

This table presents a maximum development scenario. The actual impact is difficult to quantify as it is based on the real intensity of development as well as on the specific types of industries built. Table 7 does not take into consideration the redistribution of existing industries in the region to a new site within the Study Area. An estimate of persons who currently live in Riverside area but work outside the area and would be attracted to employment opportunities closer to home also cannot be accurately made.

5.9 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The State Environmental Checklist was adapted to table form for use in scoping of project specific evaluation. Each factor relevant to the Study Area and City was assessed for potential significance for each of the Specific Plan Phases. Table 8 shows this evaluation matrix.

TABLE 8
Projected Employment

Plan Phase	Project	Regional
	Number of Employees	*Projected Population Based on Employment*
Phase I	16,100	48,300
Phase II	8,000	24,000
Phase III	17,300	51,900
Total	41,400	124,200

1. Assumes 1.5 employees per 1,000 square feet of building area
2. Assumes ratio of population to employment 3/1

Source: Beland/Associates, Inc. based on analysis factors found in the "Economic Practices Manual", State of California Office of Planning and Research, January 1978.

5.10 PERSONS AND AGENCIES CONTACTED

City of Riverside

- Mr. Merle Gardner, Planning Director
- Mr. Stephen Whyld, Principal Planner
- Mr. Frank Nall, Senior Planner
- Mr. Fred Porphir, Principal Engineer, Electric Division
- Mr. Hans Kamrath, Public Works Department
- Mr. George Kamrath, Public Works Department
- Mr. Bill Gardner, Chief Public Works Engineer

Western Municipal Water District of Riverside of Riverside County (WMWD)

- Mr. Bob Cantu, Senior Project Engineer
- Mr. Don Harriger, Manager

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD)

- Mr. B. Campbell, Facilities/Operations
- Mr. A. L. Hovanec, Director of Right-of-Way

Edgemont Community Services District

- Mr. Sam I. Gershon, Vice President
- Albert A. Webb Associates, Consulting Engineers

Southern California Edison Company

- Mr. Jack Baughman, Planning Division

County of Riverside

- Flood Control and Water Conservation District
- Office of Road Commissioner and County Surveyor

Southern Pacific Pipe Lines, Inc. (SPPL)

- Mr. L.O. Luthor, Colton Station Superintendent

Four Corners Pipe Line Company

- Ms. Claudette E. Saunders, Agent Land and Right-of-Way

California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS), Division 08, San Bernardino

- Mr. Tom Smith, Public Affairs
- Mr. Dick Scoia, Planning Section
- Mr. Bill Bailey, Project Engineer
- Mr. Richard M. Slater, Railroad Clearance Agent

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company

- Mr. E. G. (Gil) Gilmer, Regional Engineer
- Mr. John Pena, Industrial Development Department

PERSONS WHO PREPARED THE DRAFT EIR

- R. Dale Beland, AIA, AICP, President, Beland/Associates, Inc.
- Paul R. Secord, Vice President, Beland/Associates. Inc.

5.10 REFERENCES

Air Quality Handbook for Environmental Impacts Reports, South Coast Air Quality Management District, October 1980

Policy Report - Southeast Study Area, Riverside City Planning Department, April 1980

EIR Manual for Private Projects, Los Angeles City Planning Department, August 1975 (revised)

Draft EIR for Box Springs Sanitary Landfill, County of Riverside, Office of Road Commissioner and County Surveyor by Willdan Associates and COM Engineers, October 1981

Draft EIR, The Springs Regional Shopping Center and Industrial Park, County of Riverside, by Ultrasystems, Inc., January 1982

March AFB, Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Report, Department of the Air Force, October 1979

Preliminary Soils Investigation, Portion of Box Springs Area, prepared by Sid Lance Construction Company by CHJ Materials Laboratory, October 1979

Southeast Area Plan, Sewer Feasibility Report, City of Riverside by Albert A. Webb, Associates, August 1981